

WIP TA Team
Interim Report Comments

Hello,

In regard to your request for feedback on EERE T2 programs, it would be nice to have a keyword, searchable database of grant or technology licensing opportunities, if that is possible. Also a calendar of program start dates, if that is appropriate.

Thank you.

Bob Lindstrom
Energy Grants Manager
Rock Valley College
Rockford, IL

Hello,

Unfortunately I don't have the expertise or time to assist at this time. I have copied the Director of our Energy Office in case he hasn't yet heard of the initiative and would like his office to provide feedback.

(Chuck, please see below).

Sincerely,

Michael Lucy
Large Parks Administrator
DC Department of Parks and Recreation

Email: Michael.Lucy@DC.Gov
Phone: (202) 673-7681
Mobile: (202) 997-0851
Fax: (202) 939-2508

3149 16th St NW
Washington, DC 20010

www.dpr.dc.gov

Thanks Kevin. So it begins.

--Ken

Ken Baker
kbaker1@mindspring.com

Your goal to establish a single, flexible technical assistance delivery for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy customers and stakeholders is very worthwhile goal.

While I have retired from the Environmental Protection Agency in 2001 I still have a deep interest in energy efficiency and the environment.

I have read the document entitled "WIP Technical Assistance Team" interim report. It is a good start but I have questions:

1. The Weatherization and Intergovernmental Program is by name an intergovernmental program and yet, there is no mention of the other governmental entities involved. Is this an oversight?
2. The Environmental Protection Agency has a Congressional mandate in both energy efficiency and the environment yet, no mention is made of how this "Team" will interface with the EPA or in fact, if they will.
3. I perceive that your customers may think that by receiving encouragement / expert guidance from your Team that they have complied with any and all governmental requirements. Is this the message you are trying to convey?
4. In your ground rules, on page 4, there is no mention that the customers and stakeholder will receive any information on other governmental requirement; e.g., Clean Air Act emission compliance, Noise abatement requirements, etc.
5. I would encourage you to identify the government entities you have (or will) coordinate with and who within these agencies the contact person is.

If I can be of service to your Team I would gladly welcome the opportunity.

Clifford Tyree
Alternative Fuel Consulting
13439 Ten Mile Road
South Lyon, MI 48178-9520
248-437-6306

Looks great!

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to review.

Elaine Jackson
Program Specialist
Deputy Under Secretary for
Health for Operations and Management (10NB)
810 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20420
Ph: 202-273-5859
Fax: 202-273-7071
elaine.jackson@hq.med.va.gov

I reviewed the interim report. It appears that a lot of thought went into the Interim Report and that the right people were involved in the

development of the information. I believe the report outlines a process to reach the right outcome. I have a few concerns, however.

It would appear that the Technical Assistance Team has its hands full right now. With that in mind, why would you want to "improve our ability to respond to EERE issues that fall outside of the focus areas of current program activities"? As it stands now, you are working at putting more "coordinators" in the process rather than beefing up the Technical Assistance Team. Why not beef up the Technical Assistance Team, not the administrators? Make the new process work with the four areas you have rather than trying to expand to others.

I would take exception to your statement that "influential customers are overwhelmed with too much information and complicated arrangements to enlist the DOE support". Mayors and university chief operating officers and not dumb people. They are there because they are good administrators. They already know how to get things done. With that in mind, will your approach be part of the solution or just another complicated arrangement?

David C. Lynch

Regional Sales and Marketing Manager
Cummins Westport Inc.
dlynch@cumminswestport.com
812-377-3902

7-8-04

TO: WIP TA Team
FROM: Mike MacDonald, ORNL
RE: July 6 Interim TA Plan

Best wishes for good progress on your efforts. As you wrestle with all the issues, a few comments on this July 6 draft for your consideration.

1 -- the figure of the Unified Model on p 5 of the draft shows a fair amount of interaction and cohesiveness on the right side (bureaucratic side)
BUT it shows just about nothing on the left side (technical side) -- the left side is "broken" or at least "crippled"
On p 6 under Roles, text is provided re Brokers but nothing much re "resources."

Let me suggest that you need to do some more research or need better info about how the technical side of TA works, especially if you want to have chances for improvements. Simply adding some arrows may make the figure look better, but you may want to do more than just try to cosmetically fix it.

Relationships between "Resources" (providers) and customers can become fairly involved. The value of trust is important. Linkages among the TA "Resources" are also important, and my take is that possibilities for major improvements lie in establishing improved, useful links here.

IF the premise is correct that better info is needed about this technical side, some evaluation of this side of the picture may be useful.

- 2 -- The proposed selection criteria, p 7, sound nice from a program planning perspective, but my experience suggests there may be other important criteria:
- relationship-building with the customer: will the TA help to establish or cement a good relationship with an important customer? (Maybe this cannot said in a program planning document.)
 - is there a need to overcome negative prior experience? e.g., is a more personal approach needed to explain key performance issues that may have caused a negative experience, and how can improvements be made to have systems work well
 - is technology adjudication needed, e.g., must some sorting between competing technologies be done to allow the customer to understand the choices better?
- 3 -- The Draft TA Matrix at the end is not specific, as the note at the bottom mentions. In the next draft, can you be more informative about what you mean by a "later date," and also give some idea of timetable and process for filling out this matrix? Also, can you give some idea of how much of a "living" document the matrix will be?
- 4 -- Re the "Future" parts of the TA matrix:
- do you really intend to limit the Power options to renewables only? Rebuild America already provides TA on other DER / CHP solutions.
 - is it worthwhile to give some indication of examples of potential "Industrial" services?
 - can you give some indication of how far in the "future" these other areas might be added?

Mark:

I appreciate the work that you are doing in developing a technical assistance model. I guess the one comment that I would suggest is simplify. As a representative of a for-profit company that is providing these services to businesses, school districts, institutions and governmental agencies, the one item that keeps coming across to me from my customers is the constant need to keep the process simple. As I look across the landscape of the energy efficiency world, I am struck by the sheer numbers of organizations that are all trying to do the same thing: promote energy efficiency. Even among the federal government we have multiple agencies trying to promote the same item (eg. DOE, EPA, Energy Star, Green Lights, Rebuild America, etc.)

What we have found in the state of Michigan, is that when the government provides "free" information/technical assistance to a school district for example (currently done via the state energy office), the customer is all too happy to take the free information, which is then put in a 3 ring binder and set on a shelf to gather dust. In fact, in the state of Michigan, I am unaware of any school district that has engaged in the SLGEI/Rebuild Michigan program that has performed the recommended modifications unless an

Energy Service Company became involved in the process and bundled the project into a neat and salable package,

Anyway, just my 2 cents...

Thanks.

Matt Flanigan

Office: 810-767-7800

Cell: 810-691-0780

Fax: 810-767-9058

E-mail: mmflanigan@trane.com

My comments:

1) I think that you are missing your target market and in the end will not achieve the efficiency or effectiveness you desire. The identified target are "decision-makers" however a few things need to be considered when developing resources for them: 1) decision-makers refer technical issues to staff; decision makers are high level not "nuts and bolts"; 2) approachability of decision-makers can be a barrier in itself, 3) decision-makers only care that resources are available but will depend on staff to decipher their value, and 4) decision-makers provide authorization and oversight, but staff are the ones who will be implementing projects.

2) I believe that two TA/information development approaches need to be considered: 1) high-level, multi-sector information/training for "decision-makers" from which they can pick and choose what interests them and 2) a more program specific, technical information/training/tools approach for day-to-day staff, Coordinators, and "customers" to utilize during implementation of EERE projects (similar to Clean Cities tools available today).

3) You've identified the various drivers for EERE project implementation. Your TA program needs to utilize them as a framework for all informational products and they should be consistent from program area to program area. I think you've already identified that

4) The idea of a matrix to identify proper handling of customers will certainly help make sure your customers get what they need, however it is hard to understand how the proposed matrix will facilitate TA.

.

Mark Riley

Coordinator

Valley of the Sun Clean Cities Coalition, Inc.

1555 W. University Drive, Suite 105

Tempe, AZ 85225

(480) 785-2962 ext. 5771

(480) 785-0480

www.cleanairaz.org

Your draft Technology Strategy is most impressive, and I realize this is a massive undertaking. As facilitator of our own "EnergySavers" program, (EPA Education Partner Program of the Year 1999), I have a couple of suggestions that I hope you can use.

1. Please include a focus on education for children. We have worked very hard to make energy conservation and natural resource management are an important part of our curriculum and instruction. Our school system appreciates the benefits so strongly, both financial and educationally, that we now have a staff of 3 people committed just to education. The driving force behind our program is that we make sure our educational materials are of high quality, and that they are correlated to our standard courses of study. We also provide teaching and classroom resources to teachers free of charge as well as provide staff development opportunities for them. In short, our students are tomorrow's resource managers, and they are a large, powerful group, and our teachers are the ones shaping their attitudes and understanding about resource management. How does this relate to technical assistance? It relates because it provides a wonderful opportunity to use technical projects as teaching tools. We are about to undertake a project with our Facilities Planning and Construction department (Rebuild America Partners) to educate the occupants of our buildings constructed with sustainable building features what the features are, how to "live" in the building to benefit the most, and how to maintain the building. We plan to promote interactive study of the building features with students.

2. You need to be "personal bankers." One of North Carolina's largest banks is Wachovia, and they pride themselves on their personal banker program. It equates to every customer having their own personal customer service rep, a person whose name and phone number they know, that can handle their banking needs. I've had the same personal banker for years now and it makes doing business so much easier. I know you can't possibly have an assigned customer service rep for every person who uses your services, but the Internet can only go so far. I would suggest you network with state energy offices, other federal agencies or offices, and cultivate more personable, accessible sources for help.

3. You need to be "the ultimate resource for information." There are so many good resources now available that were not there a few years ago. While I know you can't promote everything, links to information and resources that are of high quality would be very beneficial. Also links to model programs. For schools, it always helps if we can talk to other school systems before we try things.

4. Finally, you need to do a better job of marketing your services. I have depended on the resources you provide for years, and find your web pages for the most part are very helpful (though I do think they are sometimes a little difficult to navigate). In any case, I refer people to your web pages on an almost daily basis. There are so many contractors around now that charge for the same services you provide and at not half the quality. I just don't think people still know what you can provide.

Good luck in your endeavors!

Mazie Swindell Smith
Director of Organizational Development
Wake Co. Public School System
1551 Rock Quarry Road
Raleigh, NC 27610

Phone 919.856.8048
Fax 919.856.3716
Nextel 2414
Mobile 919.868.4143

Dear Mark:

It is my pleasure to review this plan and to offer feedback on behalf of PTI. I have also forwarded your request to the PTI Sustainability Task Force, chaired by Roger Duncan. Hopefully, this will garner additional feedback from the local government perspective.

Good to hear from you!

Warmest regards,

Ronda Mosley
Director - Sustainability Programs
Public Technology, Inc.

Hi,

I have a few comments. I think the process is very good, and if we were talking about all buildings related programs, this makes sense. However, since we are talking about buildings, vehicles and State Energy Offices, I don't think you can make all the square pegs fit into one round hole. Specifically:

Different expertise needed for each program type (buildings, transportation)
Commingling of funds is not a good idea
The process will take too long to complete, leaving 2005 w/o any measurable results.

Thanks,
Greg

Greg Zilberfarb
National Clean Cities, Inc.
7-B Loudoun Street, S.W.
Suite 120
Leesburg, VA 20175
O: 703-779-4890
F: 703-779-4891
Cell: 703-626-4628

I have worked in the Nevada State Office of Energy on the programs that you have included in your report. I will take each of the programs in turn.

Clean Cities – This is a program that is misplaced in the grouping. I have seen more progress in putting vehicles on the road and promoting the displacement of fossil fuels than any other program. I feel that the emphasis should be on heavy duty fleets and not government fleets so you get more fuel displacement. We have put 6000 vehicles on the ground in Las Vegas that use alternative fuels. The coalitions, we have two with a third on the way, have been effective with their outreach. In my opinion, the Clean Cities activity should be in the Freedom Car or Hydrogen arena where the Clean Cities infrastructure could put alternative

vehicles on the road. The Clean Cities coalitions and headquarters staff do a good job of technical transfer in their national meetings, coalition peer exchanges and advancing the choice events

State Technical Assistance – As mentioned above, we have had no problems getting technical support when we needed it. Sandia Lab has provided us with support on Solar information, NREL is always helpful on the renewables front, the Regional offices have provided contacts and funding as necessary to solve problems. Wind Powering America has provided the venue to support our rural economic development by supporting our wind utilization programs. When NREL, WPA and our office partnered with the USDA Farm Bill outreach we were able to contact 13 towns in our state. This was done thru our cooperative extension group from the University System and our state economic development commission.

Working with the Geo Powering the West program we have an active working group and recently hosted an Alaska delegation to bring them up to speed on geothermal resources utilization potential. The hosts from Nevada included federal, state and local government officials, developers in the industry, academia and geothermal power producers. In short, some of the systems function well and are not broken, so don't mess with them. I think the Clean Cities and Technical Assistance are working well especially in Nevada. If you have further questions I may be contacted by e-mail or by phone at 775-684-8735.

Peter Konesky, Energy Specialist, Nevada State Office of Energy

727 Fairview Dr. Ste F
Carson City, NV 89701

I read the interim report and was quite impressed. However, being new in my position with the City of Henderson, I'm not sure I'm experienced enough to comment on any issues that should be added, or removed. I would like to be notified when comments and the final report are made available. If I can assist in any way please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Danielle Turner
City of Henderson

Charlie: I actually have many concerns re: the report, which to some degree could be considered more marketing/communications based in scope:

1) Page 1/Objectives: How do you plan to effectively communicate technical assistance available to "high-level decision makers" especially those considered new customers and unaware of resources or process? It would seem "the cart is coming before the horse" 2) How will customers know the value of TA?...Clean Cities has more than 20,000 stakeholders; 3) Very often industry and coordinators initiate the deployment process followed by electeds as the process matures.

2) Page 2/Stakeholder Feedback: 1) How would, if at all, the first four bullets relate to Clean Cities?; 2) How do we see feedback first hand; where does the feedback come from; where will it be posted?

3) Page 3/Technical Assistance Delivery Goals: 1) What is the cost savings in the analysis? 2) What are specific activities and dollar amounts of savings?

4) Page 4/Ground Rules #2: 1) What does #2 mean? 2) What will happen to the people we have now?

5) Page 4/Technical Assistance Definition: 1) The process in place for Clean Cities is clearly effective. In my opinion the definition stated makes little sense.

6) Page 5/Toward a Unified Model: 1) Define a TA Management Team. 2) How will they be identified?
3) Who contracts the money?

7) Page 6/Technical Assistance Matrix: 1) Give an example of "cutting edge assistance," what is meant?

8) Page 7/Selection Criteria #4: 1) You are not dealing with "apples to apple," i.e., the energy savings between building vs transportation is not parallel. Vehicles are traded approximately every two years; 2) How do you deal with complexities of dirty vehicles crossing borders (Mexico to US markets)? 3) The Clean Cities program would not be measurably competitive with the other deployment programs.

9) Phased Implementation: 1) What happens to the Clean Cities name? 2) What happens to companies that provide service in this country as well as internationally? How do they get money?

10) Page 8/TA Team Schedule: 1) Frankly, what's the rush? In my opinion more study and review is required.

Bert Kronmiller
Coordinator
Clean Cities Coachella Valley Region
32-505 Harry Oliver Trail
Thousand Palms, CA 92276
760-343-3456 ext. 138
760-343-4147 (fax)
kronmiller@sunline.org

The 4 program areas selected for your initial efforts are mostly targeted toward technical assistance to state, local and clean cities coalitions. Do you plan to review programs to provide technical assistance to other federal agencies?

I am interested in energy & water conservation audits, green energy advice and technical assistance for historic National Park buildings at Shenandoah National Park. Which part of DoE handles this type of technical assistance?

Thanks,
Charles Newton
National Park Service
540-999-3451

It appears that you are on the right track. As the Equipment Repair Manager for the State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation, I have a valued interest in your Clean Cities program, that would focus on alternate fuel vehicles, to include light, medium, heavy-duty and off-road equipment. Reduction of our dependence on foreign oil in conjunction with reducing emissions and alt. fuel infrastructures is another major issue I face. Hopefully you will be expanding the technical assistance and information that you presently provide to Clean Cities.

Maintaining specific sectors such as Buildings and Transportation to me is a good idea.

Keep us posted.

As a interested participant, I think the interim report draft is a good start - no comments!

Thanks!

Jim

James L Szatkowski, PE, NSPE

Outreach Coord/Project Manager

Div of Public Works, State of Idaho

<http://www2.state.id.us/adm/pubworks/outreach>

jszatkow@adm.state.id.us

208-332-1905

208-334-4031 fax

I applaud your pilot program. McQuay is a RBA partner and I have made many presentations for the program. I see that your proposed Technical Assistance plan will compliment those efforts. Let me know if I may assist in any way.
Sincerely,

Julian R. de Bullet

Director of Industry Relations

McQuay International

Cell: 703-395-5054

Fax: 703-430-4672

I received the email on this and it looks good to me. Ron Weis at the State Energy Office is more the contact. Best wishes,

Bob Painter

Energy Specialist

816-759-7313 Ext. 2263

robert.painter@dnr.mo.gov

here are my questions/comments as requested:

1. please define the "overall deployment strategy". this is necessary to further understand the TA model.
2. please expand on "program efficiency" What is the baseline of operations cost and what is the target for improvement? How will we know when we have achieved "efficiency"?
3. Will there be a comparison of what we do now with the new model to assure thee efficiencies are realized?
4. the report mentions two specific improvements:
 - a. "improve our ability to respond to EERE issues that fall outside of the focus areas of current program activities"
 - What are the focus areas of current program activities?
 - What types of issues do you anticipate and in what number that fall outside of the "focus areas"?

b. "respond effectively ..to customers...

What are the portfolio needs and who are the targeted customer groups?

What "additional jurisdictions and niche market opportunities" do you foresee that are not being served currently?

5. do we know that "best practices" are not being employed across programs? what examples of best practices do you have that will "improve the quality and cost effectiveness" of technical assistance?

6 mention is made of four program areas for the initial focus: clean cities, Rebuild America, Building Energy Codes, and the State Technical Assistance Pilot.

a. Three of the four mentioned are programs - how many technical requests in the past year have been received for Rebuild, Codes and Clean Cities? Do the number of requests justify this effort?

b. The technical assistance pilot is just that, a pilot with specific boundaries that are not program specific - suggest you define this effort either in the paper or as an attachment.

5. "reducing infrastructure cost" - what is the baseline and how will this be measured?

6. Technical Assistance is defined with a certain set of terms. Does technical assistance include deployment or better yet marketing of the various programs sometimes referred to as "awareness" - which in our current design is a precursor to the other activities mentioned in the report. This is a very key distinction because it is the difference between the passive approach of waiting for a request or the active approach of creating the interest.

7. please provide as background each of the programs methods of delivering technical assistance around which the team was able to find enough "common" features to propose a unified model.

8. both the model diagram and the section entitled roles skirts the details of how this will really work. There is no linkage to the model and the stated goals of improvement either in delivery or cost. Please detail roles, responsibilities and mechanisms much more definitively so that we can really understand what is intended. The diagram is not self explanatory.

9. While the draft matrix of technical assistance providers seems to be all inclusive by including every constituency group we have ever dealt with (labs, contractors, associations, business partners, states, utilities, universities, other Federal agencies, peer to peer) how will we ever be able to compare cost, technical ability and more importantly budget for all of these resources?

10. you mention multiple technical coordinators and a ta management team - please give a real life example of how these folks will coordinate with all the resources in 9 above, how the funds will flow, and the timeframe envisioned for the satisfaction of a technical request.

I concur that the goals of the ta team are reasonable and desirable. I do not believe that this interim report has enough of the detail or structure to know that we hve reached an improvement or have achieved the goals.

David Waltzman
Regional Team Lead
Rebuild America Program
303-275-4821

Maurice Kaya
SEO Director, Hawaii

Page 1

- I am not real clear on how both objectives are different. They both seem to suggest that the objective is to better deliver TA from sources external to EERE's current programs.
- Again, what is the distinction between influential customers that appear to be mayors and university COOs, and targeted customer groups. Why does this distinction need to be made. Hawaii views all of these customer segments no differently in our ability to access and deliver TA. It may be helpful to better define who the customer audience is for the purposes of this memo.

Page 2

- From Hawaii's perspective, there is great desire to have access to all of the TA resources in EERE through a coordinated, cohesive effort.
- EERE should continue to strive to develop a TA access and delivery system that is customer driven, by emphasizing continuous customer input and feedback loops.
- The attempts to address TA appear to be ad hoc at present. For example, the ORNL and NREL state program TA efforts appear to be initiatives generated by those organizations. In many other cases where TA is accessed, states must expend considerable effort to identify where appropriate resources lie within DOE. Once determined, additional effort must be expended to interest federal programs managers to offer the desired TA.
- An explicit goal of this activity should be to establish the appropriate need-driven mechanism for TA, to possibly apply it to the initial programs cited, but to expand its applicability across all programs.

Page 3

- If this is so, then the applicability of TA delivery should be mandated across all EERE programs for this program to be successful.
- Since success is measured by square footage retrofitted, a valuable part of TA will also include measurement and verification, and building commissioning.
- Should including training for designers and code officials, if not an explicit part of implementation, compliance and enforcement.
- Since SEOs are often asked to comment on the potential for EE and RE in their states, TA for resource assessments will be an invaluable activity.

Page 4

- Direct expert intervention is not clear. Does this relate only to the services component? TA may be desired for a product, for example, new liquid desiccant cooling, that can be satisfied by the direct intervention of an expert from the labs. This paragraph would benefit from a clearer distinction of the terminology.

Page 5

- Where do the national labs fall into this chart? Are they considered to be a part of current DOE resources? If so, would the developed TA model apply to all DOE lab TA resources?

Page 6

- If adopted it would be important to institutionalize these mechanisms within the EERE establishment. The WIP TA Team should consider how to achieve a TA access program that can be sustained within the organization.
- The matrix will serve to function as a useful tool to delineate organizational assets and coordinator responsibilities. From the customer's perspective, it may still prove to be too daunting to understand. It may be advisable to make sure that DOE's constituencies understand that they can rely on a simple POC to access the numerous parts of the TA matrix.

Page 7

- And is there a way that this can be achieved based on the results of the TA provided?
- This criterion means that whoever evaluates TA has to know what is important to various state or local entities.
- Does this mean that any entity that previously received TA will be given low priority, no matter how significant the TA request?

Page 8

- The TA effort upon successful demonstrating or "piloting" within WIP should be quickly broadened to encompass other EERE program areas for maximum benefit to customers serviced. Unless there is an upfront commitment from management to support the broad application of this TA effort, other programs may resist efforts to access TA until all of this two stage piloting is completed, much to the detriment of both EERE and its serviced customer base.

- Will the process of obtaining external inputs, since this is a stakeholder driven process, be made a part of this plan. You are encouraged to do that so others can ascertain how they can best get their inputs to the committee.
-

I reviewed the WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report posted at:

<http://www.eere.energy.gov/wip/tafeedback.html>

I think it would be beneficial to show how the “Specific Request Criteria” presented on the last page evolved into the Proposed Unified Selection Criteria on page 7. That is, is this a consolidation, revamping, or an entirely new set. It might be helpful to form some sort of diagram as to how the current criteria map into the proposed criteria. Also, it is not possible to tell whether this criteria is gated (must satisfy each criteria/test) in order, or what happens if some, but not all of the criteria are satisfied.

Thanks,
Sean McDonald
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Battelle Washington Office
901 D Street, SW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20024-2115
TEL: 202-646-5217
FAX: 202-646-5233
email: sean.mcdonald@pnl.gov

My comments are informed by being on the staff of the Southeast Regional Office from 1999 – 2002, where I provided technical assistance through FEMP, Rebuild America, Clean Cities and SEP. This year, I have also provided TA under the Training and Technical Assistance program as a private consultant. I offer the following comments based on two instances of TA that I considered to be effective:

1. The Regional Offices offer an excellent pathway to quickly identifying customer TA needs and to providing TA that is tailored to those needs. For example, in 1999 the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta was designing a \$190 million campus expansion and was seeking sustainable design assistance for one or more of their new buildings. While Georgia Tech had worked closely with the Southeast Regional Office (SRO) for many years, the university had not established formal partnerships with any of the WIP programs. Working together with Greg Andrews, the SRO Rebuild Program Manager, we helped Georgia Tech expedite joining Rebuild with a Partnership agreement signed by Dr. Robert Thompson, Senior VP for Administration & Finance. We then educated the Georgia Tech design team on the LEED process and recommended they pursue a LEED rating for their new College of Management. Greg arranged for TA from Rebuild consultants at Oak Ridge and we recommended a private sector LEED architect and DOE 2 model consultant to the design team, both of whom were hired by the university. We also worked with David Dunagan, SRO Program Manager for Clean Cities, to secure a grant for electric vehicle charging stations at the new College complex. As a result of the multi-program TA delivered through SRO, Georgia Tech earned LEED certification of their new College of Management when it opened in Fall 2002. Georgia Tech has now established LEED certification as a design standard for new campus buildings. The key to this successful TA for a motivated and influential Southeastern university was the ability of SRO staff to tailor assistance

and deliver it when needed for a fast-track design project. The project's success begat further commitments to sustainable university operations.

2. In 2004, Sarasota County revived a dormant Rebuild Partnership to help develop a county-wide energy management plan for buildings and fleet. Jim Ley, the County Administrator, came to Sarasota County in 1997 from Henderson, NV, where he had a positive experience with starting a Rebuild Partnership, and he urged his staff to establish a Partnership in Sarasota. After it was established, the Partnership became inactive, due to staff changes, but it was revived this year and SRO committed T&TA resources to meet an aggressive energy planning schedule from Sarasota County management. Greg Andrews arranged for regional consultants with expertise in building design and operations in hot and humid climates were brought in to facilitate the County's energy planning meetings. Additional Clean Cities resources were employed to address fleet energy options, such as hybrid vehicles and biodiesel. As a result of delivering timely response to multi-program County needs through the T&TA vehicle, SRO staff have enabled the County to develop realistic energy reduction goals and made departmental managers aware of the process and resources needed to achieve the goals. This County effort will be a model for a larger community-wide energy management program in Sarasota County.

I consider the role of the ROs to be critical in defining and delivering TA targeted at the specific needs of the customers. The Regional Office program managers can bring knowledge and resources to the table, offering customers a comprehensive and responsive approach to TA delivery.

Richard S. Combes, P.E., Ph.D.
RC Consulting, LLC
2 Kingfisher Cove
Fripp Island, SC 29920-7101
Voice: 843/838-3328 Fax: 843/838-3328

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft document. It is always healthy to review how we do things. This discussion has gone on for years and there is no single or simple answer on how best to deliver our services. I have two general observations and then several specific comments. Overall, it strikes me that there is (1) no clear problem statement and (2) there is only one option and that one does not appear to reflect outside-the-box thinking.

(1) The discussion about our deployment services has been complicated by uncertainty over the role of EERE. Some think EERE should concentrate on high-risk, long term R&D. Over the last fifteen years or so, there have been differing directives on where deployment fits in. We have had to invent or adapt new language, from technology transfer to market transformation and now to technical assistance, etc. Consequently, we built a deployment system with different strategies from different eras. It may be a patchwork quilt but what is missing from this report is the question: "what is the problem?" The report states we want to increase the efficiency and impact, but there is no statement what is wrong with the current system. If there is a unanimous unwritten assumption about that, it should be written. Developing an answer without a clear problem statement will cause confusion and lead to uncertainty about the effectiveness of the solution.

(2) I know there is a tendency to think consolidation is useful and can be cost-effective. I'm not so sure that is always the case. One size does not necessarily fit all. Trying to stuff square pegs into round holes does not always work either. Each of the four program areas you address requires a different kind of expertise. You are essentially requiring the "broker" to be a jack-of-all-trades, who either knows the answer or must know where the answer resides. Decentralizing that process to six regional offices, fifty state offices and headquarter program staff requires a very large trained cadre of generalists. Consequently,

I am struck by the fact that you only present one model. There may be more efficient models that reduce the 56 (or more when you include headquarter staff) points of entry. That may be heresy, but if the objective is efficiency, presenting only one option falls short. So, one observation is that it's not clear if you have really thought outside-the-box or simply tried to reflect the situation as it is and are simply moving the deck chairs on the Titanic.

More specifically....

In the first paragraph under Background/Rationale, the discussion misses the issue of what motivates decision-makers. The drivers are presented but the focus seems to be on technical assistance rather than the needed understanding of how decisions are made. One simple fix is to add the word "requisite *motivation* and knowledge" in line five of the first paragraph. More useful would be a clearer discussion of the need to help decision-makers understand the economics, incentives, perceived non-monetary benefits (productivity, reduced insurance costs, etc) that should be an important part of our technical assistance and deployment strategy.

In the Objectives portion, I am curious about how the group decided the two specific improvements. It's not clear that they were driven by the following paragraphs. For example, the second paragraph seems to call for "simplified access" rather than the specific objectives in the first paragraph. The objectives in paragraph three seem inconsistent with paragraph one and the stakeholder feedback doesn't seem to demand those two specific actions from paragraph one. This goes back to the question of a clear problem statement. Then I am really surprised at the narrowness of the examples of high-level decision-makers listed in paragraph one. Limiting the examples to mayors and university COOs does a disservice to corporate, government and small business leaders and NGOs or trade organizations.

The technical assistance matrix and related process looks cumbersome and time-consuming, but it's possible it will work better in action than it looks in writing.

On the selection criteria, I think a unified list is useful, although there may be different emphasis and there is always the possibility of "high priorities" entering into the mix. I regret there is often subjectivity that will over-ride an objective list of criteria. One item I think is missing, is a more directly stated "Is there a likelihood of success?" Another would be, "Do the costs and available resources appear to be realistic?" On #6, why confine it to WIP goals, why not EERE or EERE and program goals? And why not add "national, regional" to state and local strategic planning? On #7, maybe add "Was it utilized effectively?"

There is an editorial suggestion. People are generally who, not which or that. There are several places such as the third line of page 7, under Selection Criteria. The more correct statement would be "everyone who wants them."

Mark Ginsberg
Board of Directors, EE-11, 6C-036
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
202 586-1394
mark.ginsberg@ee.doe.gov

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Technical Assistance Interim Report.

1. The report seems to be a combination of (1) stating the obvious (need for TA, page 1) and (2) organizing in written form the current mode of delivering TA. The flow chart very closely resembles the way I "process" TA requests now; a telling statement on page 2 states that "Regional offices...attempt to bundle resources for certain customers...despite TA processes, rather than being enabled by them." Revisiting the efficiency of TA delivery is warranted, as I would

- expect continuous improvement to be fundamental to the activity, but significant modification of the process will not always be required ("If it ain't broke...").
2. Identification of and easier access to the "other resources" (not the national labs) through the TA Matrix could be an asset, but this "Yellow Pages" approach could get unwieldy and would require continuous updating to maintain current contacts. Who would do that? The alternative, of course, is to have POCs in place who have a sufficient breadth of knowledge of programs and resources to effectively link the resource with the requester.
 3. It seems the "salesman of the week" problem has more to do with EERE soliciting activity rather than communities asking for assistance. A community or individual making an initial request should fit easily into the flow diagram on page 5.
 4. The 4th bullet in "Stakeholder Feedback" isn't particularly clear to me, but the way I read the "best practices" issue is that each program has its own version of "best practices." This is already organized around building type (residential, commercial, etc) in numerous documents (i.e. Building America/EEBA Builders Guides). Isn't this just a matter of identifying useful documents?
 5. In general, some formalizing of the TA process may ensure consistency so we're all working out of the same playbook, and organization of the vast amount of materials available would be useful, but like so much of what we do in the ROs, building relationships with both the providers of TA and the communities who make the requests is fundamental to effective (and appreciated) delivery of services.

Doug Seiter
Energy Codes/Building America/Community Partnerships
U.S. Dept. of Energy, Central Regional Office
1617 Cole Blvd., Golden, CO 80401
(303) 275-4810
doug.seiter@ee.doe.gov

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this report.

We support the goal of establishing a single, flexible technical assistance delivery mechanism for EERE. The ability to access technical assistance is especially important to our Hawaii Rebuild America program which has 16 partners scattered on our four major islands.

We concur with the objectives of the improvement of delivery services. We have received valuable TA through the Rebuild America Network, FEMP, and the National Labs, as well as from NASEO and other states (especially New York, Oregon, Idaho, Iowa, and California).

We concur with and emphasize that there is a need to capture and disseminate best practices across programs as well as for specific programs.

In the Table "Customer Groups and TA areas for the Four Targeted Programs" please add to the "TA Areas" for Rebuild America: sustainable development, measurement and verification, performance contracting.

Unified Model. This model appears similar to the Rebuild America model. In this model we enter our request into a website, receive an email confirming the request and assigning someone to provide the assistance whom we can contact if necessary. In Hawaii, because of time difference, we prefer to use electronic communications as much as possible.

Questions: What efforts have been made to ensure the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the proposed unified delivery system? Will additional staff be hired and/or additional contractor costs be incurred? Will costs be pro-rated to states on the basis of how many requests are made and their complexity?

Elizabeth S. Raman, Ph.D.
Energy Conservation Program Specialist
Strategic Industries Division
P.O. Box 2359
Honolulu, HI 96804
Tel: 808.587-3806; Fax: 808.587-3820
Visit our website at
www.hawaii.gov/dbedt/ert

It seems to me that this model (page 5 of the draft) doesn't really fit the way Clean Cities does business.

When I think about this, it seems the model will have the net effect of increasing the number of layers of bureaucracy between the customers who need technical assistance and the source of that assistance.

Last but not least, it seems that the goals and momentum of the Clean Cities program is a better fit within the FreedomCAR umbrella than this current model.

Sue Leitner
Clean Cities Coordinator
Tri-State Clean Fuels Network
Hamilton County DOES
250 William Howard Taft Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219
Telephone 513-946-7772
Fax 513-946-7778
Sue.Leitner@Hamilton-Co.org

Hello, I was asked by our field office, NE-ID, to review the WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report. It looks like the committee has worked hard on this idea and I hope it is successful.

I'm a Department Manager at the INEEL (soon to be INL) for Sustainable Buildings. My department is in the Energy Efficiency and Technology Directorate and we serve EERE as one of our customers.

I just have a few comments:

1. In the Proposed Unified Selection Criteria, include uniform geographical and/or population based distribution of projects receiving technical assistance. This will help distribute the resources equitably.

2. Please include the Idaho National Lab in the Draft Matrix of WIP Technical Assistance Services and Providers. INL is a multipurpose national lab with programs in transportation, hydrogen, biomass, renewables and efficiency.

Cheryl O'Brien

I am associated with the NY City Clean Cities Program and have utilized DOE resources for a number of years now. I have been extremely pleased with DOE, the labs and other contractors in the timeliness and quality of assistance I have received over the years.

As such I am concerned about that child slipping out with the bathwater. I have over 20 years of experience in government and have worked with many federal and state and local governmental programs over the years. The Current Clean Cities approach has to be one of the few programs that has consistently provided information that is accurate and timely and often in need. I prefer to think of the existing model adopted by Clean Cities as the model that should be adopted by the other units.

By that I refer to the development of excellent materials by NREL, The prompt attention given to requests by NREL, the development and deployment of the tiger teams to provide technical assistance to coalitions and the incredible assistance offered by headquarters and the regional offices.

Frankly, this program works because of those services.

I admit that my coalition is somewhat unique as we depend on DOE more for technical assistance than for funds. We secure most of our own funding and our budget often exceeds the clean cities budget in scope. We do not have the ability to secure technical resources however and that is what we rely heavily on DOE for. The assistance we need is not salesmen of the week and is not geared to Mayors. I work with fleet managers in the public and private sectors as well as with fire and building s departments. I need practical information that is accurate and up to date. I need assistance from staff familiar with changes occurring around the United States. I need established conduits for information that have served that purpose for the past few years.

So, in conclusion, I do not see how the proposed program would work as well as the existing program.

I appreciate your offer to comment.

Thank you

Mark Simon, Director
Alternate Fuel Programs
NYC DOT
59 Maiden Lane
NYC NY 10038

The unified model on page 5 lists State Energy Office staff as brokers in the process of delivering technical assistance of advanced energy technologies. Since the SEO's staff time and budgets are already committed, how does DOE envision that the SEO's can be one of the two brokers within the realm of their current funding? Or, will DOE make new funds available to the SEO's to act in the capacity of a broker? Also on page 5, does the box "Selected Resources" mean DOE contractors? If not, how do all of the DOE contractors fit within the model? How does the Model improve contractor performance? We would appreciate DOE defining the membership of the TA Management Team that will be making decisions on the level of technical assistance provided.

Bonnie Ziemann
bziemann@mail.state.ne.us

The following are my comments:

Will there be one budget for all Technical Assistance?

It appears that a great deal of work and thought went into the draft.

Margo Appel
US DOE

The Science, Technology and Energy Division of ADECA (the Alabama energy office) fully accepts the recommendations of the WIP TA Team to reorganize the technical assistance delivery into a unitary system. This will be a vast improvement over the current structure of providing technical assistance separately to the four target programs (Rebuild, Clean Cities, Energy Codes, and State TAP). This will greatly improve the opportunity to provide multi-sector technical assistance and expand to other sectors beyond the four target programs. We support the concept of State Energy Offices and DOE Regional Offices playing a key role as Technical Assistance Brokers. We look forward to the forthcoming implementation of the reorganized delivery of technical assistance. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this important undertaking by DOE.

Russell Moore
Section Chief, Energy Efficiency
334/ 242-5294

Comments and Review of the WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report

Background/Rationale

This section speaks to the value of having a technical assistance program in the EERE portfolio that includes research, development, demonstration, deployment, and commercialization as key components to an integrated energy program. Providing technical assistance to stakeholders/partners is critical to the deployment effort. This section also goes on to say that the service is highly valued by our customers and that we need to continually evaluate how that service is delivered.

What is missing in this section is the recognition that most deployment programs evaluate their information delivery system on a yearly basis, experimenting with new and better ways of doing things. Many of the grants issued in Clean Cities, Rebuild America, Codes and Standards are structured so that new ways to inform audiences of the EERE message can reach targeted customers. Workshops, seminars, conferences, websites, peer exchanges, focus groups, electronic clearinghouses, document preparation, energy fairs, case studies, student design competitions, and the Science Bowl all provide state-of-the-art approaches to pass information. Other innovative ways to improve the delivery of technical assistance include using GIS

systems to target customers, using follow-up surveys to poll workshop attendees and reducing administrative barriers to access technology experts have recently been employed. In my opinion, the single biggest barrier to providing technical assistance to customers is reducing the cost of doing business with us. I do not see where there has been an evaluation of current practices to determine if, and where, improvement needs to take place. For the benefit of our current customers and partners, we should define our starting point; and define what's broken? Part of the background statement should demonstrate that this evaluation as been performed. Otherwise, this whole document looks self-serving.

Objectives

The objectives are interesting. First we want to be able to respond to issues that we currently respond to on an ad hoc basis and second, we want to respond to customers with multi-technology needs. Why? Are there not existing organizations that have the ability to respond to questions regarding environmental benefits, economic development, and climate change concerns. Isn't there a little mission creep here? Should we not leave questions like these to the EPAs, USDAs, and HUDs? I believe in one stop shopping, but I certainly don't want to be the one to council a local government on how to line up financing through an ESCO, or how to calculate environmental benefits from CO₂ mitigation.

The second objective is to respond to organizations requesting multiple services. Do we have a count on how many requests from these organizations we have had? This would be a useful number. A technology assistance program that is designed to attract or recruit this type of client will require us to "cold call" organizations. Since we would not specifically know what the client's needs are, we would have to show up with a menu of programs we offer. This approach also works well in the rare situation where we have been called by the mayor of a city, or the president of a university or the CEO of a business. This just does not happen. It is not the mayor or president that calls me. I field calls from Transportation Supervisors, Building Facility Managers, University researchers, renewable resource developers, and others with specific questions about programs we offer. Their interest in DOE information is usually not general, but it is targeted to a specific need they have at that moment.

DOE-EERE is primarily an energy information "wholesale distribution" organization. Our primary audiences are State Energy Offices, working groups and Coalitions we have established, and the occasional local government or private industry. The "retailers" in this business are the State Energy Offices. Their client base is much larger than ours and their position as state government makes them much more approachable by their constituency.

Stakeholder Feedback

In reading over the Stakeholder Feedback, I come away with these observations:

1. The first bullet is correct for customers that need multi-sector assistance. Just what percentage of customers fall in this category? Based on my experience in the field, my first thought is that we have very few entities that fall into this category. That is, unless we develop a program that actively pursues this type of client. It would be nice to have some numbers to support one side or the other. Of course, the current system is efficient for current customers and stakeholders because they know exactly where to go for service.
2. The second bullet is DOE feedback. This isn't stakeholder feedback.
3. This is DOE feedback as well. Regional Offices are part of DOE. This isn't stakeholder feedback.
4. This is also DOE feedback, dealing with internal program operations. Without changing anything except a DOE priority, this could be taken care of right now.
5. Final bullet is a statement from stakeholders suggesting that DOE offers highly valued technical assistance. This actually compliments the previous information delivery system.

This is a very weak section. This section should be the very strength of this report. It should be demonstrating that there is a demand from our customers for EERE to make beneficial changes in delivering technical assistance, but in fact, it appears as if DOE is providing negative feedback and not the

customer. Where is the evidence that stakeholders' feedback is negative to how DOE delivers TA? I am not seeing it here.

Technical Assistance Delivery Goals

I would change the first goal to read: Streamline technical assistance to ease delivery, improve current and future customer access, and reduce infrastructure costs.

Providing customers who request multi-sector assistance is important. However, a vast majority of DOE technical assistance will be directed to customers who want assistance for a specific issue or concern they have. This is the way it is now, and I do not see the trend changing unless we actively pursue a different course. In addition, a lot of the requests for technical assistance will continue to come from our current customer base. According to the chart in the report, EERE already has over 800 current customers (700 Rebuild, 80 CC Coalitions, 56 State Energy Offices) in the programs targeted. Most of these customers are in need of single sector technical assistance.

Ground Rules

Change the third ground rule to read: "We will not permanently disrupt or compromise existing technical assistance services provided to customers."

Toward a Unified Model

The model, for the most part, describes a reasonable approach to provide technical assistance. Cosmetically, I would change the size of the boxes. The customer box should be the largest box, the RO/SEO box should be middle sized, and the TA Management team should be the smallest box. The way it looks now, we are incredibly egocentric.

Other points:

1. The RO/SEO box should also include our partners. EERE uses financial assistance to establish coalitions and to retain staff at the state level. The box identifies the SEO staff involvement but not the latter. The coalitions are just an extension of DOE and should be included as technical assistance providers. I believe the same argument could be made for contractors.
2. There is no description of the TA Management Team. Does it reside at the regional level or at HQ. The most efficient approach would have the TA Management Team at the regional level or local level. Anything that moves decision making from the local level will be inherently less efficient.
3. I do not foresee a lot of requests for technical assistance being fielded by the TA Management Team. In theory, DOE has previously retained the best individuals at the local, state, and regional level to provide technical assistance. It would be a pretty unusual question or request that would stump them.

Technical Assistance Matrix

Delete everything in this section after the first paragraph. First it does not make sense. Second, it is very difficult for me to understand how adding two additional layers of decision making (TA Management Team) makes this process more "effective and efficient." Currently, I just call a researcher at a National Lab and get an answer.

The concept of an "electronic transaction tool" is curious. More specific information is needed to explain this. It seems to me, that we are moving from the old technical assistance delivery approach that was a "person-to-person" transaction to a delivery approach that is a "person-to-machine-to-person" transaction. Aren't you just saying that this is a log that tracks requests and outcomes? This is detail that isn't needed in the report.

Selection Criteria

This is really confusing. The first six pages describes the goal of the new technical assistance approach is to become more efficient and effective at delivering TA. It goes on to say that we would actually expand the services EERE provides so that we can deliver multi-sector TA. And, now we acknowledge that demand will exceed supply. If that is the case, why would we want to expand a program when we already can't meet the demand?

This seems to say, if we adopt the Unified Model we will become more efficient and effective at delivering technical assistance, and at that point, we will need to become more restrictive, and bureaucratic in order to keep customers out. I don't see the logic.

Isn't the only real goal of developing a technical assistance program to encourage customers to save energy? The only real filter (selection criteria) that is needed should be number 4.

Virtually all of the selection criteria are DOE motivated. They have nothing to do with serving the customers; providing assistance to the customers; or helping them to solve energy-related problems. In fact, it makes my job more difficult when I have to explain to a customer that their request has been bounced because the TA being provided isn't replicable, or their commitment of in-kind resources aren't enough.

At a very minimum, this section should have been an internal DOE document and not shared with our partners, and customers. I would prefer doing away with the complete list and adopting 2 or 3 guiding principles that we will follow when our ability to supply TA is diminished. The other possibility is to structure the program like a solicitation and respond to the best proposals. At least the process would be competitive and fair.

Jeffrey W. James
Western Regional Office
Seattle, WA
206 553-2079
jeffrey.james@ee.doe.gov

Feedback on the Interim Report

1. Overall this looks like a great start.
2. Unsure who staffs the TA management team and how those positions are filled.
3. There needs to be a clear feedback mechanism for informing the Brokers (ROs and SEOs) about the TA provided and denied in order for the brokers to continually improve their role by knowing what is and is not being provided. It references the TA coordinator networking with the TA providers and assisting the TA management team in monitoring and disseminating results. This is good--this type of relationships needs to be codified between the brokers and the TA providers/coordinators/management team since the better the brokers are, the better they can directly serve, handle and/or screen initial TA requests.
4. Under the twelve proposed unified selection criteria: any concern about "should the TA request be served by the private sector instead of the govt.?" Maybe this is covered by number 2--other readily available technical resources. But at some point there will need to be a line drawn for when we do and do not provide assistance--such as do we provide design assistance to a residential home builder who builds 10 homes a year. 100 homes?
5. The first selection criteria asks if it's a DOE partner. If the goal is to get away from the "program of the week" or the stovepiping of DOE programs and their problems with delivering TA, should this even be a criteria?

6. Selection criteria 10 talks about requestee's willingness to share data. Industries where competition is fierce are getting increasingly private about data, whether for locations of solar installations, exact costs of production home building and results achieved by production builders, or the biggest energy users in the country in chemical and petroleum refining. This will be a tough problem when the industrial component is addressed later--most large industrial customers will NOT share data. DOE's plantwide assessment audits deal with this issue constantly--they protect most proprietary data and only are allowed to publish final, general results of energy savings after the company reviews the report. This is manageable for these audits as they are large \$100,000 projects--I'm concerned that with small projects that level of separation and review won't be feasible and many companies will balk at our TA due to the sharing.

7. Phase II of the program plan doesn't address one very critical area--the work of the TA management team/others to work with the DOE program managers who run programs that provide significant TA--specifically to work with them during strategic and budget planning.

8. Why is Building America not among the programs? While it's technical classified by Building America management as a research program, they provide enormous amounts of TA to production home builders--it's really a hybrid of research and TA delivery. I can't see why the building codes program (commercial and residential) and rebuild (commercial) will be involved while building america (residential) is left out. DOE's had a gap in TA on residential buildings for a long time and including building america in this would be a good step.

That's it for me from the Central Regional Office.

Jamey Evans

Dear Sir:

We are writing in response to the WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report request for comments. The Center for Sustainable Energy only recently become aware of your proposed changes in the delivery of technical assistance. Please be advised that the Center is a member of Rebuild America and a Stakeholder in Clean Cities New York, and is committed to furthering the development of sustainable energy strategies.

We were disappointed that such an important issue came to our attention so close to the time that comments are due. Because we feel that this is a matter that is so important with regard to accessibility of information that can be used for planning and service delivery by a wide range of stakeholders, we believe it is extremely important to have adequate time to consider how this is addressed in the proposed plan.

Accordingly, we urge that the deadline for comments be extended to provide a thorough and thoughtful response from the community of stakeholders. We propose that another month be permitted to allow this to occur.

We look forward to the opportunity to be active participants in this dialogue.

Sincerely yours,
James Quigley, Ph.D.
Acting Director
Center for Sustainable Energy
Bronx Community College
City University of New York
Hall of Fame Terrace, GML104
Bronx NY 10453
Voice: 718-289-5334
Fax: 718-289-6443
Email: james.quigley@bcc.cuny.edu

Dear Colleagues:

After reading your report, listening to Charlie on the phone, and following discussion with a number of my Clean Cities colleagues, I wish to share some of my thoughts with you. Thank you for the opportunity.

Because I'm not convinced Clean Cities needs to be reorganized or redesigned, and that we're only allowed to REACT to what's being proposed, I find myself reacting to this technical assistance report with a sense of distrust.

I don't trust that ... the Dept. of Energy apparently will be in charge of the flow and direction of queries coming in about energy and efficiency. DOE is the gatekeeper (Page 5, large paragraph at the bottom.)

I don't trust ... that the state energy offices will buy into this model. I found out today that the director and his key departmental advisor know nothing about these proposed changes. I fear that due to state-level budget concerns, and some past history, the SEO's won't aggressively solicit the public in energy awareness.

I don't trust ... that the "public" will actively seek out energy efficiencies. It has been Clean Cities' experience that the public has to be wooed, actively approached, "spoon-fed, motivated with incentives, etc. Selling energy efficiency is a very "hard sell." We WORK at educating the public.

I'm suspicious of the idea that Clean Cities is considered a "customer" of DOE. I thought we were colleagues.

I also don't believe Clean Cities is terribly important to DOE as demonstrated by the recent redo of the EERE website. Clean Cities is in there, but you have to make an effort to find topics, areas that used to be much more apparent.

I'm concerned that the various parts of this reorganization effort are being done in virtual vacuums to each other, which makes it feel like a project that does not wish to succeed.

And, finally, I'm concerned that I feel like the owner of local, small bookstore after Barnes & Nobles moves into the neighborhood. Yes, the books are there; it's a nice big store; plenty of resources. But something is lost, like personal service, knowing the names of the people who work there, a depth of knowledge and someone to hold you hand ... for whatever reason.

Respectfully submitted:

Beverly Miller, director
Salt Lake Clean Cities
Office of the Mayor
451 S. State St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801-535-7736
Beverly.miller@slcgov.com

p 1

Objectives section pp 1 last line -- add local school boards

p 3

customer groups Rebuild America -- should be more than 600 instead of over 700 community partnerships

p 7

add education and outreach

add metrics for education that are outside current metrics, but are within SEP metrics

add metrics for education that are not captured in any current metrics

Appendix Draft Metrics

Just a question -- are educational (school) buildings included in commercial and public buildings or should they be a separate category since so much work is done in those buildings (K-12, community colleges, and colleges and universities)

Blanche M. Sheinkopf

National Coordinator

U.S. Department of Energy's EnergySmart Schools

(Rebuild America Schools)

1104 Parkside Place

Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

(321) 779-3768 (phone)

(707) 885-1029 (fax)

(321) 223-3950 (cell)

Mark: I know you and the rest of the team there at DOE are well meaning in structuring this revision to how we do work in 50 states but, I frankly don't know how to read and really approve of what you describe.

What EERE is trying to do (combine various related technology and client activities) has been tackled by the private sector for decades. Instead of reinventing the wheel, why hasn't a successful marketing and service organization been called in to provide consulting? If you don't want to go to the private sector, go to NYSERDA which has similar programs to DOE's and even has its performance evaluated by an outside organization to measure its effectiveness.

From my point of view, which is from the Clean Cities side, we are only held back by lack of funding and lack of staff. Many of us contribute plenty of unpaid hours to accomplish the goals of the Clean Cities program. I don't know how things look from your level. I only know how they look from my state and nearby states, and only in vehicle related areas. Does the captain of a ship really go down below decks to ask the crew which way the ship should sail or how the crew should be organized?

I don't believe I saw mention of adjusting each state program for the priorities within each state or for the laws within each state, or the funding, co-funding, etc., within each state. I think that is vitally important. Have DOE people, working with their state and municipal counterparts worked up the best system for their state, one that reflects the realities in that state? What is good for OK, may not be good for RI or FL, or WA or HI.

I believe it is too late for the federal sector to presume to run energy TA programs in the US. The DoE appears to have lost that initiative to the states. Even today's NYTimes lead editorial "Signs of Energy" (read it)! stresses that it is the states, not the federal government that has taken the leadership on energy issues. Perhaps then, it should follow, rather than lead.

There is no mention of adding staff and resources to these DOE efforts when many of us feel our toughest battles are due to US federal policy which is basically a "consumption is good" policy. Look at the funding levels for these EERE programs. Look at the lack of federal leadership on petroleum reduction, on Greenhouse gases, electricity use. I know none of this is your personal fault but involving hundreds of people putting labor into an internal DOE issue which may amount to nothing is a bit disingenuous, don't you think?

I scanned all 11 pages. If you think that each state should have a person, or an office, to serve as a clearing house for EERE TA requests, that sounds OK to me. Now, FUND IT. Hey, I'll apply for the job. Let's see, 50 Clearing house staffers at roughly \$100,000 per annum all inclusive. Why, that is \$5 million. In other fed agencies, that is a pittance, but not at the DOE.

Obviously, I must care about your request as I keep on writing. The great fault of the presentation at Clean Cities is that you and Ellen announced there was a problem and there was an ongoing fix and you wanted us to buy into it. We did not know there was a problem and we did not know there was a fix to be done. We have already bought into the Clean Cities program with our sweat equity so we do not like being told that someone, somewhere is dissatisfied with the way we are doing things and has decided they should change.

Here is another question? Which of the state's have the most effective energy reduction programs and why? Has that been looked into? Is it because of the quality of the DOE staff, their funding levels, the support of the state government and their leaders, the support of municipal organizations. That would be good to know. NJ is doing well with its Clean Energy Program. I suggest you check into that.

OK, wrapping up, in return for all the info I have just provided, I'd like to know:

Q1. Just who wanted this reorg effort done?

Q2. What triggered it?

Q3. How much time or funding was allotted to it?

There is not an infinite amount of volunteer labor out there for the DOE programs to take advantage of. When people donate as much energy as I have seen done by both DOE staff and local Clean Cities, DOE should not presume they are easily led. We want results in the form of reduced energy dependence, cleaner air, and stronger government. There is someone bigger than you standing behind you, offering \$100,000 tax rebates to Hummer buyers when a hybrid gets \$1500. (Did you know that the fuel to power 1 Hummer for 15,000 miles is enough to power 5 Prius each driving the same distance?) Mark, the truth is we use ~500 million gallons of petroleum and diesel fuel a day and its still going up. We need real help from Washington, not shuffling of organization charts, even if well intentioned.

I look forward to your response on my questions to you. Thank you.

Art Vatsky
NJ Clean Cities Coordinator (2003)

I am the coordinator for the Granite State Clean Cities Coalition and an environmental engineer for the New Hampshire Dept. of Environmental Services. We work very closely with our state energy office on a variety of programs, including Clean Cities, however due to recent reorganizations and budget cuts the energy office has significantly fewer resources than it did several years ago. In fact, we used to share

coordinator duties with our energy office until these cutbacks when they stopped dealing with alternative fuel vehicle issues all together.

I am concerned in reading your technical assistance program reorganization proposal that you intend to direct most inquiries first to state energy offices and other state agencies. Although there are a lot of comments and concerns that come to mind I will be brief and simply ask you to truly understand the level of cuts that have been made in state government in the last 2 years and to understand that we are already doing way more with less. We cannot take on any additional roles to make up for services that may no longer be offered by DOE. I am already having to tell people that I'm sorry, I cannot help them due to lack of staff. Please don't add to that burden. We will not be able to absorb it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Ohler
Granite State Clean Cities Coalition
NH Department of Environmental Services
PO Box 95
Concord, NH 03302-0095
(603) 271-6749
rohler@des.state.nh.us
www.granitestatecleancities.org

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback. We offer these comments in a constructive framework and commend the effort to improve your service delivery capabilities with SEOs.

First, it is good to have an explicit definition of "Technical Assistance." The term is often bandied about quite casually without much clear meaning. Their definition seems functional: "...the specialized technology, policy, planning, or financing assistance that is delivered to overcome market or action barriers...involves both products, such as guides and software tools, and services which involve direct expert intervention...". Also, the two identified needs for improving the Technical Assistance [TA] delivery system are straight-forward enough -- *for issues that fall outside current program areas, and for broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs.

The Unified Model on page 5 appears on its face to be serviceable, but presents a basic question that does not have an apparent answer. How is the "TA Management Team" constituted? Is there somewhere an independent DOE TA management Team, or does each of the TA service provider agencies have one of these standing by for the formal requests that frustrated requestors submit? Or are these TA Management Teams to be somehow generated ad hoc per request? They play a key role in the proposed system and it is critical to know who/what they are.

And recognizing that some sort of screening process probably has to be employed, still the Selection Criteria on page 7 look to supply the feds with just about any reason they might choose to simply deny requests. Certainly it can't be that for every request to be eligible it has to satisfy all of the 11 or 12 items. The nature and extent of the analysis needed to determine whether a request meets any/all the criteria runs directly counter to the first Goal on page 3 -- streamlining technical assistance to ease delivery, improve customer access, and reduce infrastructure costs.

Finally, a cursory survey of Energy staff also indicated a not very high level of satisfaction with the existing TA delivery system for *regular requests involving only one sector or technology. One program manager said that anything would be an improvement.

Again, thanks for this opportunity. We look forward to seeing the outcomes of your planning effort.

Brian Tormey, Chief
Energy and Waste Management Bureau
Iowa Department of Natural Resources
502 E. 9th St.
Des Moines, IA 50319-0034
515/281-8927

I am relative new to the SEO in Kansas, however, over the past three years, I have observed things more as a private (businessman) citizen (tax payer) than a state employee. I bring many years as a business man and manager to this job. Each state is required to meet certain criteria for the different awards that are available. Each state has it own specific needs and programs that will work well with the federal mandates. The way I see it, is that it would work better if more monies were allocated to the states and less to contractors who in turn ask the states to complete their surveys so they can analyze the situation. I feel these monies could be better spent if distributed through the states and not contractors. As far as the reorganization of the federal programs, I'm not versed enough to make any recommendations on that.

[Jerry K. VanAllen, CPM](#)
[Assistant Energy Program Manager](#)
Kansas Corporation Commission
1500 SW Arrowhead
Topeka, KS 66604-4027
Phone: 785-271-3184
FAX: 785-271-3268
Email: j.vanallen@kcc.state.ks.us
[All Reports Emailed to: sep_reports@kcc.state.ks.us](#)

Dear Sir/Madam:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the U.S. Department of Energy's Clean Cities Program.

First, please know that the City and County of San Francisco formed one of the nation's first Clean Air Vehicle Coalitions in the late 1980s. Given our shared "mission" with the newly formed Clean Cities Program when it was introduced in 1993, we decided to apply for designation as a Clean Cities Coalition. We have been very active and are proud to be one of the most successful coalitions in the country.

It is not clear to the stakeholders who have read the proposed changes, exactly what impact this will have on our efforts to promote the use of alternative fuels in order to reduce air pollution and improve energy security. There is great concern that this proposed reorganization will force us to lose focus, increase bureaucratic intervention, and decrease our effectiveness.

With all due respect, no one here has been supportive of this proposal. In fact, several stakeholders have threatened to leave our coalition in response to what's seen as "government meddling of the worst sort" to quote one stakeholder. It's been the most time consuming distraction that most of us can remember. And it's perceived by many as a cynical attempt to reduce our effectiveness and many here are beginning to question DOE's interest in fuel displacement and energy security.

Unfortunately, rather than spend our time on our exciting projects, the past few months have been spent trying to understand the reasoning for the proposed changes and to hold onto the stakeholders who are losing interest in the organizational chaos that's resulted from the threat of the reorg plan.

The most frequent questions we get are, "why do they want to change something that's working so well?" Another stakeholder just gave notice saying that his company cannot justify being involved in broader efforts that include other DOE programs like Rebuild America, Energy Codes, other State Energy Office activities, etc.

The proposed reorg, whatever it may actually be, has resulted in some good discussion about our own reorg thoughts. Please consider the following:

1. If there is to be any DOE reorg, it should make Clean Cities the deployment arm of DOE's existing hydrogen and other vehicle technology programs, such as Freedom Car and other Fuel Cell divisions. Clean Cities is an extraordinary deployment organization and reflects government at it's best, in terms of a small organizational investment that has resulted in literally thousands of stakeholders joining force to realize assumed DOE goals like improved energy security.

2. If anything, any DOE changes should build on the Clean Cities model. Strengthen coalitions. Support them. Pursue more funding for us.

3. The existing technical assistance support is excellent. Strengthen it. Give us even more resources.

4. We have had great success with the Clean Cities name over the years. This branding effort has been very successful with very little financial support. The name "Clean Cities" is valuable. Don't change it in order to make something look better in a report if it only serves to undermine our efforts.

5. Be careful when changing the role of State Energy Offices. Some have not been supportive of Clean Cities goals. With all due respect to our colleagues in Sacramento, CA, adding another layer of bureaucracy to this DOE program would NOT be helpful. The process is already time consuming. Furthermore, most State Energy Offices are experiencing unprecedented budget shortfalls. California is one such state that is suffering from a horrible budget crisis. Using DOE Clean Cities money to fund SEO activities may only serve to support what they already do and leave little or nothing for coalitions throughout the state.

Again, we do appreciate this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Rick Ruvolo

Chair, San Francisco Clean Cities Coalition
Manager, Clean Air Program
Department of the Environment
City and County of San Francisco
11 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Tel: (415) 355-3762

Mark Bailey,

I appreciate the work you and your working group are doing to improve EERE technical assistance. I also appreciate you forwarding your document for review. I understand that you will be providing another opportunity for review at a later time. Since my schedule didn't permit me the time I would have liked to spend reviewing the proposal I'll be giving more thought to your proposal between drafts.

Let me start by noting my continuing concern that EERE address the fundamental issue of resource allocation for their deployment efforts. Simply stated, sufficient funding at the state level is necessary in order for deployment efforts to be successful. If I've learned one fundamental concept about successful implementation of energy efficiency and renewable energy in my thirty years of experience it's that success is inextricably related to one's ability to develop and maintain successful relationships. Successful results are severely hampered if funding for on the ground support is haphazard. It is extremely important to have continuity of service to consumers since in the vast majority of cases consumers will rarely act to adopt energy efficiency practices based on a single contact. States are very well placed to provide ongoing assistance to EERE's target audiences. In order for EERE to deploy energy efficient and renewable energy technologies, products and services effectively, EERE should more fully support state efforts to engage the citizens and businesses they serve and, in addition, provide adequate resources to the states to assure that sufficient staff is available to promote the efforts of EERE and respond where feasible to many of the technical assistance requests.

Specific comments regarding your proposal are addressed below.

You have identified a number of objectives for your effort to improve EERE technical assistance. While all of your objectives are laudable the prime focus should be to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of in-depth consultations. One factor in achieving that result is to fully utilize the states as the prime evaluator of the technical assistance requests. Most of the time states will be able to determine the seriousness of the consumer's intent to act on the information and assistance to be provided and to know what technical assistance from EERE and other sources is available and best suited to the request. States are uniquely well qualified to serve as aggregators of services to consumers. The result, I believe, is that EERE's limited resources will be stretched further and enhanced with local resources.

It appears that an underlying premise to your proposal is to do aggregation of technical assistance services at a higher level. This can work in some limited situations such as the industrial sector where regional EERE offices do have a pretty good understanding of the services that are available. However, given the limited resources of regional offices, it is unrealistic to expect them to have a great deal of involvement with technical assistance requests. Fortunately, states can act as an effective filter.

Finally, my review of this proposal was a bit hampered by a need for better definition of a couple of terms. You may have some good understanding of what is meant by "best practices" and "technical assistance" but it would be best to define what your intent is. In the case of the later term, I equated your interest in improving technical assistance to be primarily concerned with in-depth consultation. Thank you again for requesting feedback and good luck in your continuing efforts.

Jake Fey
FeyJ@energy.wsu.edu

Mark –

I'm sorry to send these comments in late, but I have been working and traveling in China for the last several weeks, and have not had access to a good internet connection for the last 10 days. As you are likely aware, my interaction with OWIP has so far been restricted to the state TAP pilot, which is in its first year of operations. The few comments that I have on the Interim Report of the WIP Technical Assistance Team are therefore colored by this admittedly limited perspective.

My primary observation, at least from being involved in the TAP process, is that funding levels and program design are not sufficient to truly fund the entire technical assistance effort. That is, the funding is dedicated to providing limited amounts of specifically targeted assistance to individual states. This is critically important, and OWIP is providing a useful function here. But... the funding necessary to create the basic knowledge base on which TAP relies, at least in my case, must come from outside of the TAP/OWIP program itself (this includes the cost of becoming an expert on state renewable energy program design, for example, on which the state TAP program relies). This has not caused a problem so far, in that at least from my narrow perspective, the wind program within EERE and Larry Mansueti's effort in OETD have willingly picked up those costs. However, I do still think it is somewhat dangerous to develop a program that (again, at least in my narrow case) requires external funding to create the expertise on which TAP relies. I don't have a great solution here, nor do I suspect that a single solution would be ideal given the range of experience in this area, but perhaps OWIP should consider: (1) specifically funding knowledge creation outside of specific state requests [maybe only in cases where need warrants], or (2) raising the \$5k cap for the TAP. This should be something that is discussed, at the least.

More minor comments include the following. On page 1, I found it somewhat odd that you specifically mention mayors and university chief operating offices. On page 2, objectives for improved delivery, first bullet: you might want to add "timeliness" to quality and cost-effectiveness. Also in the same bulleted list, third bullet, non-EERE programs like OETD's work might also be mentioned. On page 3, in the table under State TAP, PUCs and SBC administrators should be added to "state energy offices" as relevant customer groups as RPS and SBC administrators need not be state energy offices. On page 4, under the technical assistance definition, it might be valuable to better delineate the kinds of technical assistance that OWIP is willing to fund, and those that DOE/OWIP are unwilling to fund (e.g., things that border on lobbying). There is some gray area here, and it would be valuable to try to clear that up.

That does it for my limited comments at this stage. The document looks like an excellent start to me, though again, my interactions with OWIP have not been extensive in the past. Good luck with your efforts to reformulate some of this critical assistance in a more logical and streamlined fashion.

Ryan Wiser, Berkeley Lab

Dear Mr. Bailey:

We are *again* writing to voice our strong concerns with the restructuring of the Clean Cities Program's technical assistance services as outlined in the "WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report."

The report states that there are two objectives of the reorganization of the technical assistance programs: (1) "to improve our ability to respond to EERE issues that fall outside of the focus of current program activities" and (2) "to respond effectively and efficiently to customers with broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs." Both of these are noble and worthwhile objectives.

Unfortunately, a glaring – and we believe crucial – omission is the objective of continuing to provide the existing (and excellent) technical assistance to the vast majority of the customers that do *not* have "multi-sector or multi-technology needs." Under "Ground Rules," the report states that "We will make every effort not to disrupt or compromise existing technical assistance services provided to customers." *That simply is not good enough.* We are not familiar with the other DOE programs discussed in this report, but we are all very familiar with the Clean Cities Program. And we can categorically state that providing existing technical services to real end-use customers is far more important to the success of the goals of the Clean Cities Program than creating a new bureaucratic layer of management to serve that handful of executives with "broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs."

Over the past few months, we know you have been gathering input about this proposal from a number of stakeholder groups. At the meeting held with the alternative fuel associations, we made it very clear that it was our unanimous position that the Clean Cities Program was working very well, and that any attempt to restructure it (as is being proposed) would only harm its effectiveness. We have been informed that this was the same message communicated during a stakeholder meeting you held with the automakers. We also know that a similar message was communicated by the Clean Cities Coalitions themselves. The almost 5000 stakeholders participating in the over 80 Clean Cities Coalitions in over 30 states are virtually unanimous in their position that this restructuring should *not* apply to the Clean Cities Program. The Interim Report, however, mentions none of this feedback. Indeed, a reader of the Report is left with the opposite impression. If all the active stakeholders and participants in the Clean Cities Program are opposed to the proposed restructuring, it raises the question of "Who is actively supporting the restructuring?" and "Why is restructuring process continuing?"

For all these reasons, we reiterate the messages put forward in our letter to DOE Secretary Abraham dated May 14, 2004, namely:

- We believe the Clean Cities Program to be one of the most effective of all of DOE's outreach and education activities. It's a program that works. As proposed, this restructuring would reduce its efficiency and undermine its effectiveness.
- Lumping in Clean Cities as just another energy outreach program will cause confusion, and harm the effort to reduce our dependency on foreign oil at this very crucial time.
- The proposed reorganization does not address the need for more resources – in fact, it would make the situation worse. It is our belief that, because of its importance and effectiveness, the Clean Cities Program is already under-funded. We are not opposed to the *objectives* of the proposal, but only if it is implemented as a *supplement* to the existing Clean Cities Program without negatively impacting the services provided to current stakeholders *and* only if additional funds are provided to pay for that supplemental bureaucratic layer. Since no additional funds for this activity have been requested by DOE in its FY2005 request (in fact, DOE requested a reduction in the level of funds from that approved by Congress for FY2004), we urge that this restructuring be postponed until FY2006 when DOE can request additional funding.
- Clean Cities should remain targeted and be strengthened.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this Interim Report, and hope that our recommendations will be adopted by the WIP team.

Sincerely,

Signature on Original

Brian Wynne, President
Electric Drive Transportation Association

Signature on Original

John Lynn, President
The Methanol Institute

Signature on Original

Joseph Jobe, Executive Director
National Biodiesel Board

Signature on Original

Phillip Lampert, Executive Director
National Ethanol Vehicle Coalition

Signature on Original

Richard Kolodziej, President
Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition

Signature on Original

Brian Feehan, President
Propane Vehicle Council

cc: The Honorable Spencer Abraham
The Honorable David Garman

I commend you for attempting to streamline the process of asking for technical assistance. One thought.

If you are developing a matrix to attempt to get the question to the right individual as quickly as possible, can you also have a brief write up about the individual providing the answer so that the person asking the question can pass along such credentials to the other persons they work with. For example:

If a technical person also has past experience working for a utility program or as a manufacturer's representative or in conducting training sessions, it may help the person asking the question to relate better since it is unlikely that the two will ever meet in person.

Herb Stonebrook
Herb.Stonebrook@state.tn.us

Staff from the Western Regional Office in Seattle has reviewed the Interim Report on Technical Assistance through the OWIP program. Specific comments from staff follow. In general the highlights of these comments are.

1) TA is a hugely valued resource for our customers. We strongly support efforts to expand the breadth and depth of services offered.

- 2) The focus and rationale for what we are trying to accomplish by reinventing the TA process needs to be made much, much clearer. We need to develop a baseline, define what's wrong, describe specifically what is proposed and describe why it is better than what is currently in place.
- 3) The TA process seems to be working for the niche markets we serve through the existing programs we operate. While improvements could be made the existing system is working for the markets they are designed to serve.
- 4) We need to acknowledge the high caliber, high quality work being performed under the existing TA programs and the need to honor commitments
- 5) General broadly-focused TA is needed in certain instances for customers with broad multi-sector needs. We support efforts that will provide that assistance.
- 6) Any new system for TA should be designed to apply to all EERE deployment programs not just OWIP programs. We should start with OWIP programs but commit to expanding this system to all programs as soon as possible
- 7) We urge you to pilot test the expansion of this model beyond OWIP programs in FY 05 and not wait until FY 06.
- 8) FEMP's solicitation for large scale TA projects is a good model we should consider including in our new EERE approach for TA.

Thanks
Paul Johnson
Western Regional Office

Report fails to identify specific improvements which would result from the proposed changes in technical assistance. Vague references to confused customers are not supported with specific examples. Proposed changes in the unified model actually add bureaucratic layers between the customer request and resulting assistance. Quite difficult to understand how these changes will result in measurable improvement. This reorganization of services and programs has been splintered and chaotic. Customers have been shut out from much of the activity and continue to ask for information and inclusion. For example, the interim report contains a timeline for steps in the process which have not been followed. Interim was scheduled to be available on the internet June 30 with a comment period of two weeks. The report was not made available till July 7th but the comment period was not extended. Such mishandling of communication does not encourage trust in the process or the intent of DOE as they move thru this process. Customer complaints received at the ROs are increasing in number and frequency as a result.

Roxanne Dempsey
Western Regional Office

My only comment on the Technical Assistance plan is that some sort of repository/online request mechanism is an important component to include to avoid having individual program managers contacted and then pass the person's request on to somewhere else. Since the interim report seems to show us as brokers, it would be good to consider such a consistent, online tool that all requests would come in through. There could also be a form filled out as a request came in, if the person preferred to speak with someone rather than fill out an online request. Otherwise, this report looks like the team has been working hard to come up with a new, streamlined system. Looking forward to seeing it continue!

Melissa Podeszwa
Western Regional Office

Technical Assistance for Building Energy Codes in the Western Regional Office is performed as follows:

1. The States send in a formal request for specialized technical assistance to the Project Manager
2. The Project Manager reviews the request and send it to DOE/HQ for their review and approval
3. HQ sends it to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to provide an estimate.
4. The Lab provides the estimate and notifies HQ and the Project Manager
5. The Project Manager notifies the state of approval
6. Technical Assistance is implemented by the Lab.

This procedure works well for me and the states are satisfied with the quick turn-around.

If you need further information, please let me know.

Molly Dwyer
Western Regional Office

PJ: I've seen comments from Maurice, Liz and Dave Waltzman and I concur with their comments. Here are a few additional comments:

1. Technical assistance is a valued service to our customers from EERE; we must continue to support and maintain.
2. Technology Development Strategy is still unclear --- must have clearer and better defined objectives. What are EERE issues that fall outside of the focus areas of current program activities? Who are these customers with broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs? How will these improve the technical assistance capability? Why does the "shared customer groups" only specify to high-level decision makers such as mayors and university chief operating officers ---- it should include all customer groups since our partnerships include a wide range of customer groups, not only the high level types.
3. I agree in applying best practices across the programs. Provide examples of "best practices" that have worked or what is being proposed. What are the processes used currently by the four programs?
4. Initial focus will be on four program areas: Rebuild, Codes, Clean Cities and STAP. This should not only be applicable to the four program areas but should extend to all programs within EERE for a uniform approach to Technical Assistance. Need a better defined model with defined responsibilities and delivery mechanisms and process in order for this effort to work uniformly throughout EERE.
5. Resources. Who, what, where, and cost??? Are these available for this effort? Will the four programs' budget be tapped to fund this unified delivery system?

Any questions, let me know.

Eileen Yoshinaka
Western Regional Office

Hi Paul et al - I just sent you the FEMP's FY-05 Technical Assistance(TA) 'Call for Projects', that briefly describes the scope and schedule of requesting such projects from the Federal agencies. In addition, we will be using the following Evaluation & Selection Criteria including assigned scores for each, before making

the Final determination, which, I believe, would be a good generic process for all EERE TA activities, including but not limited to OWIP program only :

1. Cost Sharing
2. Financial & Technical Merit
3. Strategic Value & Replicable/Showcase Potential
4. Agency(Customer) Support
5. Project Description
6. Project Implementation Plan

Each of these criterion will have Maximum Score Points, sub-divided into High, Medium, and Low categories. Just for the sake of example, each of the top four(4) criterion is assigned maximum points of 20 each, while each of the last two, 10 points each, totalling 100. Points for High, Medium, and Low in each criterion, could be uniformly assigned as proportional weights. It would be a good idea to have this type of TA system uniformly applied to all eleven(11) EERE programs for consistency and credibility. Hope, this is helpful. Thanks.

Arun Jhaveri
Western Regional Office

My comments on the attached report as it would relate to the WAP program:

It appears that the need for the proposed changes are to improve our ability to respond 1) " to EERE issues that fall outside the focus areas of current program activities." and 2) "ability to respond effectively and efficiently to customers with broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs."

I think the system proposed would work well for these specific needs, but would not necessary show an improvement for focused areas of current program activity which have been successful in the past in providing TA to a well-defined customer base.

- 1) Would all TA activities be centered at HQ rather than a combination of RO and HQ?
- 2) Would current programs/regions be competing against each other for TA funds?
- 3) How would projects be funded? Would all applicants apply once a year or on a continuous basis until funds were gone? Will there be separate pots of money for each sector?
- 4) Take care not to disrupt or compromise an existing successful TA process for the WAP for the following reasons:
 - a) In WAP, resources are often shared between states. This process doesn't seem to take into account TA from one state/agency to another.
 - b) WAP offices are often not related to other energy needs of the state or region and do not look to DOE for multiple TA needs.
 - c) WAP program has shared resources and best practices with other state/utility run programs for many years. Many of the DOE adopted standards are also adopted by other funding sources.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Comments on TA Team Interim Report
7/6/04 Version

1) Training/Skills Mix

The approach you have described is a sophisticated matrix organization that relies on numerous "performers." I believe it would be helpful if the team spent some time discussing how to ensure that we have a well trained and highly skilled cadre of performers who will be able to meet the TA needs. In the past, TA was provided by the same folks who had developed expertise in a specific technology area over time and brought that experience with them as they became more involved in deployment. The team may need to consider whether this type of "on-the-job training" is likely to continue under the new approach, and if not, how people will gain expertise in specific technical areas. The same observation applies to Federal (HQ and RO), lab, and contractors. We all know that there is a learning curve for our specific technologies and TA, and that it's hard to substitute for that experience on short notice.

2) National Priorities

Related to training, the team should spend some time identifying what national priorities DOE will use to prepare and plan for specific types of TA. We want to respond to customer/stakeholder needs to be sure, but I believe it is equally or more important to establish those national priorities for which there is an important Federal role in defining the need and establishing TA to help diffuse knowledge about those priority technologies. For example, we may have a statutory requirement to provide education and outreach, including TA, in a specific technology area. We may have a national priority, such as electricity reliability for several years, then switch to another national priority, such as hydrogen, for several years. These priorities are not static, but I believe they do exist. This implies that the TA team should be aware of EERE priorities and work closely with the technology programs to develop a multi-year plan. It will be important to communicate those TA priorities and areas of emphasis to the stakeholders, receive feedback, and plan accordingly.

This leads to an important issue. How do we balance a DOE priority for TA with customer needs? For example, what if customers are saying we need more TA on projects for energy from municipal solid waste, but we don't see that as a big priority relative to our other compelling TA priorities. These kind of trade-offs may have to be made ahead of time, rather than on the fly, because it will take time to ensure we have adequately trained personnel and performers prepared to supply specific TA. Furthermore, these trade-offs may need to be documented so that we don't raise expectations of the stakeholders and then disappoint them.

3) Funding issues

As the team has identified, EERE will be adopting the new approach while maintaining strong customer service in traditional areas. This leads to the important question of how appropriated resources are matched with delivered technical assistance. As long as EERE receives specific appropriations language for specific program activities, the handling of cross-cutting or multi-technology TA will have to be handled delicately. The team should probably spend some time analyzing what kind of flexibility or constraints the appropriations bills place on our TA activities.

A second funding issue relates to how, when, and how much funding will be allocated to which performers to provide the TA. In the past, selected technology areas knew how much was available for TA and gave it to pre-selected performers. With a matrix organization, some responsible party will have to estimate the TA needs across the matrix and assign a resource allocation to each performer. This may be a non-trivial

task if we require specific technology expertise in several technology areas. It will be further complicated if we need performers who are multi-talented and able to respond to novel TA requests from innovative customers. The more complicated the matrix, the more complicated the allocation formula. This too deserves study.

4) Announcements of availability of TA

Some TA requests come "out of the blue" at random times during the year. Some come during visits by HQ and Field staff with customers and stakeholders. My experience indicates that a lot of TA requests come in response to an announcement. For example, a technology area will announce the availability of TA in a certain area and solicit applications for TA. Sometimes a mini-review is conducted and TA projects are "reviewed" and "awarded." The team should study the implications of how the availability of TA will be made known. This will affect the type, quality, and subject matter of requests for TA. For example, if TA is announced at a Weatherization conference, we will get certain types of TA requests. If it is announced at an alternative fuel conference or buildings conference, we will get other types of requests. In a way, due to the matrix organization, each of the potential customers is now competing with the others for TA. The timing of the announcements of availability may need to be synchronized, such as creating a TA "season", in order to avoid flooding the TA request system in waves. Even if announcements are not coordinated, one can foresee confusion about when TA requests should be made and processed. On page 5 of the interim report, the implication is that the "broker" will determine if a formal request for TA is needed. The team should study the implications of this approach. What happens if the customer is disappointed with the broker and goes over their head to HQ? How long will the HQ team have before responding to the broker's request? Who will manage the TA once it is decided that special TA assistance is needed? Will the broker be involved with the special assistance? What standard operating procedures are needed to ensure that all these decisions and allocations can get made in a way that improves TA delivery for our customers?

5) Triage/selection of most important TA requests

You folks have developed an excellent set of criteria (page 7) to help with triage of multiple requests. The question for the team to apply, in a matrix organization, is consistent and timely application of the criteria. Will all the brokers apply the criteria the same way? Will each of the technical coordinators? When will tough issues get raised to senior management? All useful areas for the team to study.

6) Goal 1 of two goals: Expand our focus areas

The interim report cites two very important goals (see page 1):

"The team would like to make two specific improvements to its technical assistance capability. The first is to improve our ability to respond to EERE issues that fall outside of the focus areas of current program activities. The second is to respond effectively and efficiently to customers with broad multi-sector or multi-technology needs. These two changes will allow us to optimize TA delivery to shared customer groups, particularly high-level decision makers such as mayors and university chief operating officers."

I find the report deals primarily with discussion of matrix approaches and does not spend that much time discussing specifically how either goal 1 or goal 2 will be met.

In order to address goal 1, the team needs to spend some time on critical issues, such as:

- Will EERE provide TA on non-EERE technologies if customers request it?
- If issues fall outside the focus of current program activities due to a lack of funding, how will it be possible to address goal 1?
- Who will prioritize the issues raised by customers under goal 1? (see my point number 2)
- What if an area is outside current program activities for a good reason, such as Congressional guidance?

- Do we have the expertise, and if so, why aren't we delivering it? If not, how will EERE develop expertise in areas outside of current program activities?
- Has an inventory been prepared of all types of TA currently provided by EERE? For example, the areas cited in the interim report cover just WIP delivered TA. But there are several other significant TA delivery efforts that may be serving the “EERE issues that fall outside of the focus areas of current program activities.” The team has correctly identified that it hard to tell if we are under-serving or not when our delivery mechanisms are fragmented.

7) Goal 2 of 2 goals: High-level customers

The report is a little unclear about how the proposed approach will better serve high-level customers. Part of the complexity is the different references to “multi-sectoral needs”. The goal 2 statement implies that we have “high-level decision makers” who have “broad multi-sectoral or multi-technology needs.” I agree with that statement. Yet in the TA matrix, the “multi-sectoral” columns include: State and Local Policy & Program Design; Strategic Planning and Analysis (including environmental issues); and Financing. While completely agreeing that these 3 categories are multi-sectoral and quite important, I am somewhat confused about the terminology. I would call all of these categories “Policy” rather than multi-sectoral. We often get TA requests on policy, financing or environmental policy issues that are specific to one sector or even one technology.

It seems the TA Team feels we are underserving these high-level decision makers by not providing them with TA on these important Policy areas. The team is probably right. But that sounds an awful lot like goal number 1 – expanding the types of TA that EERE provides. We don’t have strong TA in Policy areas because we haven’t had a strong set of policy efforts in many of our technology programs that have translated into TA. The report could describe these deficiencies and how we might build up that capability.

Since I trust you did not mean to repeat goal 1 inside goal 2, I believe the team was trying to address the problem of ineffective and inefficient delivery of TA to high-level customers who have needs in more than one area. (In fact, these high-level customers are likely to have needs in both technology and policy areas, but if we had the policy expertise, we would still want to deliver to them efficiently and effectively.)

Therefore, the final report should describe better how TA will be more effectively and efficiently delivered specifically to the high-level customers, and what the real proposed changes are to the EERE delivery mechanism. It’s hard to tell from the proposal described in the interim report (on page 5) as to how high-level customers would be better served. They still have to contact a broker, at the RO or SEO, as they do now. The broker either handles the issue or passes it on to other staff, as they do now. Requests that can’t be handled in the field are passed back to the “TA Management Team” which is pretty similar to the way things happen now. Maybe I missed something, but I just don’t see an explanation of how this change will help better serve the high-level customers (unless the brokers are better trained in areas outside our current focus; but that’s goal 1 again.)

A related question is how many brokers are proposed and how they would be organized. Would each broker at each Regional Office have the training and expertise to handle all types of TA requests? Or would each broker have a specialty? Would there be a unique broker for high-level customers? Would the RO Director be the broker for high-level customers? Is the problem that the high-level customer doesn’t know who to call?

A related question is whether high-level customers are the beginning, the middle, or the end of the TA. In my experience, high-level customers are often involved at the conceptual stage, with resource identification, and launch of projects, but quickly delegate implementation activities to sub-ordinates. The TA team should study the implications for what types of TA need to be delivered at what times in the evolution of a TA project. One implication of this study could be that stream-lining of TA delivery will not automatically create better service for high-level customers. Are the high-level customers actually making TA requests?

The final report could use some clarifying examples of real requests from high-level customers that are currently responded to inefficiently and ineffectively. That would help focus the reader's attention on the types of requests and how the new approach will help.

8) Workload

The interim report is rightly focused on how we can improve delivery of EERE TA. I did not find in the report, however, references to resources, workload, efficiency, or personnel. I found one reference to "improving cost-effectiveness" and to "best practices." This is a ripe area for study in order to support the goals of improving delivery. It would be helpful to document the current areas where resources are inefficiently allocated; personnel are over-worked or under-worked; which existing TA is using best-practices and which are not. It would be helpful to know if the TA efforts with lots of money also have the best practices or instead have gotten bloated and inefficient due to having lots of money.

EE-20, David Rodgers, 7/23/04

from jim esposito
1035 ridgeoak road
sapulpa, oklahoma
74066

porkchop3802@msn.com

918-248-8846

1. with all due respect, from my viewpoint, experiences, and age (60).....i have to tell you i am a novice.....to the subject of alternative fuels, i am trying to learn, to keep from being confused by all of the "mess" that seems to be floating around in the private and public sector.....i need "help" ... "kiss"simple.....and i am not happy with what i see to date.....!
2. i look to educational material and information resources.....i am thankful for "google"and other search engines.....
3. i have limited time.....so a index of summary information seems helpful for my searches of alternative fuel.....simple, direct....
4. a governmental search engine that would provide updated information regarding current and pending laws,rules,policy,programs and procedures is necessary to save time.....and confusion.
5. from a "wanna-be"like to be of some help in seeing alternative fuels put in place today.....i would appreciate guidance to assist our local, state and federal politicians motivated to see this gets done (before i die i hope).
6. i would like to see some examples and see some success stories of how private sector buisness has produced "mini-production" plants for production of bio-fuels.....see pro-forma/budget/return on investment.....comparisons of and ratings different production equipment providers.....etc.....information on forumlas and testing.....etc....

7. i would like to see a department of technical assistance which would provide a guidance program and take a free-enterprise assistance approach for novice entrepreneurs.....from begining to endfrom production of a simple business plan, finance options/grant support/sba-score assistance to reality.....

thanks, jim esposito

**Comments from National Clean Cities, Inc to U.S. Department of Energy
Regarding OWIP Technical Assistance Interim Report**

Authored By: Sam Spofforth, Linda Hardie, Anne Tazewell, National Clean Cities Inc

July 27, 2004

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the “WIP Technical Assistance Team Interim Report.”

National Clean Cities, Inc (NCCI) considers Technical Assistance (TA) to be among the most critical components of the DOE’s Clean Cities program. Many NCCI members are individual Clean Cities coalitions that depend on robust, highly accessible and responsive TA in order to develop projects to fulfill their missions to deploy alternative fuel and other projects to reduce our dependency on imported petroleum.

We applaud your stated objectives on page two. Because TA is so important to Clean Cities coalitions, we always support efforts to improve service delivery, and add or leverage new useful tools, services, and capabilities. Indeed, one of the strengths of the current program is how responsive that the current TA staff are to suggestions for improvements and additions, within budget constraints.

Unfortunately, the plan as outlined in the interim report would not strengthen TA or help to accomplish the stated objectives in the Interim Report. The problem is that the proposed changes are fundamentally inappropriate to the unique needs and characteristics of the Clean Cities program, its mission, coalition structure, stakeholders and consumers. Based on our review and reviews and comments from many of our coalition members, we believe that the proposed changes would make TA for Clean Cities more confusing, distant, wasteful and bureaucratic – resulting in a weakened transportation-related deployment effort.

We also have more general concerns the process. It is a mistake to evaluate and modify components of the Clean Cities program on a piecemeal basis, e.g. TA, name, headquarters support, and so forth. This process is likely to result in a weakened program that will lack coherence and reduce its effectiveness.

One of the objectives of reorganized TA is to increase efficiency of TA delivery. The Clean Cities program, with its local coalition structure, is already a model for efficient and effective TA delivery. Coalitions already do the job that otherwise would need to be done by the U.S. DOE, consultants and/or state energy offices (SEO) at far greater expense to the government. In order to do their job, coalitions themselves must have direct access to TA focused on the core areas of transportation related to the mission of the program.

On page 3, the 80 Clean Cities coalitions are identified as one of the “customer groups,” along with fleet managers, equipment and fuel providers and state/local government. In fact, the coalitions, by design of the program, are actually partners, colleagues and collaborators with U.S. DOE. Fleet managers, whether in the public or private sector, are customers served by coalitions, wherever they exist.

In order to serve these customers and develop projects effectively, coalitions need to have direct access to nationally organized TA resources. Yet this proposal, based on the model on page 5, would eviscerate these transportation-focused resources and separate coalitions from them by layers of inefficient bureaucracy.

Currently, TA for Clean Cities functions as follows:

- Clean Cities coalitions and their coordinators actively work to develop domestic fuel and other transportation projects by promoting these alternatives and developing local public-private partnerships. Coalitions are the first point of contact for customers of TA as U.S. DOE seems to define customers. However, coalitions are not in a passive role, as a SEO/RO staff would be, waiting for calls. Coalitions and coordinators have learned that active initiative is the key to producing results. This is why the program overall is so effective.
- If/when coordinators themselves need TA they can directly call the Clean Cities hotline (1-800-CCI-TIES) and/or visit the web site. (SEOs, customers, or the general public also can and do use these resources, of course.) Hotline staffers have expertise in the subject matters related to Clean Cities. They have a proven track record of responding quickly and thoroughly to information requests. The web site, especially prior to recent changes, includes a great deal of useful information and links to more.
- If more or specialized information is needed, coordinators can contact NREL TA personnel directly without having to go through a layered bureaucratic procedure (SEO, generalized DOE, etc). Coordinators have told us that they have an excellent track record of responding quickly and seem to know how and where to access information.
- In cases where more sophisticated and ongoing assistance is needed, there is a simple, easy to understand and access mechanism, the Tiger Team program, by which that request is evaluated and the need met, if the need has merit. Coordinators have direct access to Tiger Team personnel if it is necessary to have dialogue to clarify needs.

It is also worth noting that the direct communication between coordinators and TA providers has resulted in periodic changes that have consistently improved the quality and relevance of TA for transportation-related projects. Current TA providers listen to coordinators and respond by making changes and additions as budgets permit. The TA providers also seem to be well networked, not only within DOE but within other federal agencies and useful private sources of information.

According to the Unified Model and TA Matrix, Coordinators would lose direct access to TA. It is unclear, based on the description and because the Matrix is not complete, how and by whom TA would be organized and delivered. But it seems clear that TA for Clean Cities/transportation deployment would lose clarity and focus by becoming blended into a diffuse bureaucracy. By funneling TA through SEOs or DOE Regional Office (RO) staff, coordinators also would lose direct access. This would result in a system that is more bureaucratic, less efficient, and far less useful for transportation deployment projects.

SEOs would appear to have heightened roles in the TA reorganization. While NCCI supports greater cooperation and increased support of Clean Cities by SEOs, many coordinators have commented that their SEOs have a track record of not being particularly supportive or helpful to local Clean Cities coalitions or the objectives of the Clean Cities program. The DOE should encourage SEOs to cooperate more with local coalitions. However, reliance on SEOs for any level of TA related to Clean Cities activities is risky at best and likely to be damaging to many deployment efforts.

The DOE, through this Interim Report, seeks to redesign TA so that much of it is “not sector specific.” This may be the fundamental flaw of the proposed redesigned TA. In the experience of Clean Cities coalitions, TA is always sector specific. In order to provide generalized information to mayors and other high-ranking officials, non-sector specific or cross-cutting TA might make sense. But the goal of the Clean Cities program, based on guidance from Congress in the Energy Policy Act, is effective deployment efforts that will reduce our dependence on petroleum. Our members have years of collective experience in what works to achieve results. We have learned that project development, including interaction with customers

with the authority to make decisions is almost always sector-specific. TA always must be sector-specific and the structure for delivering that TA must be focused and directly accessible.

The plan envisions using outside parties, such as “business partners, non-profit associations, states, other federal programs, universities, utilities, and peers.” This is a good idea and, again, the existing TA for Clean Cities already is a model for this type of network development. However, these resources are sector specific and such a network is not a replacement for a national, transportation focused TA program.

The plan spells out criteria for delivery of TA. What’s most interesting to us about these criteria is that most of them already are built into the Clean Cities local coalition model. Being designated a Clean Cities coalition requires those seeking assistance to be involved with a local coalition. Coalitions always attempt to tap local and state resources initially and have the contacts and expertise to do so. The Clean Cities program already requires coalitions to carefully analyze and track energy security impacts of any potential project. This is another example of how the redesigned TA proposal in the Interim Report seems to be not designed with Clean Cities in mind. The new TA structure would fail to take advantage of efficiencies and effectiveness that already exist in the current program. In the best case the DOE would inefficiently duplicate the Clean Cities model; worst case, it would undermine its effectiveness.

Finally, NCCI has a few general comments, one in response to a remarks made by Charlie Hemmeline of U.S. DOE on the conference call held on July 8, 2004 and another on the process in general.

In response to a question asked during the July 8 conference call about the applicability of the Unified Model (page 5) to Clean Cities coordinators, Hemmeline responded that the Model would have little or no applicability and that TA accessed by and provided to Clean Cities coalitions would change little, if at all. This implied that no change would be made to TA as related to Clean Cities. We would prefer this “no change” option to what is being proposed here.

Hemmeline’s response further illustrates a point that we have made before about the proposed reorganization in general. It seems designed to fix ills in other OWIP deployment programs, such as Rebuild America, not Clean Cities. Indeed, given the unique model and organization of Clean Cities, with its local coalitions, and its exclusive focus on the transportation energy sector, the proposed changes in TA and reorganization in general do not make sense.

In conclusion, NCCI always appreciates efforts to improve any element of the Clean Cities program, including access to and delivery of TA resources. Unfortunately, in this case, the proposed changes would do more harm than good.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Louisiana Energy Office comments on Proposed OWIP Changes to Technical Assistance/Deployment

General Comment: The process utilized within Rebuild America works. A request is routed to our contact and that contact helps find the needed resources. This process was recently repeated in the Technical Assistance request of a couple of months ago where DNR was able to get help from NREL, EPA, and others with quantifying the potential emissions reductions resulting from the City of Shreveport project. That analysis is ongoing but it has been a very good experience so far.

Specific Comments on the proposed Unified Selection Criteria:

1. Appears that the request coming from a current partner or coalition member is only going to be a consideration during Phase I. Clarify how this is going to change subsequent to Phase I.

2. **Is the request and/or problem clearly defined and does it fit within the scope of WIP TA activities?** This should be the first criteria or the requirements for dealing with the question cannot be accurately gauged.
 3. **Will TA have significant, sustainable impact—energy savings, environmental benefits?** How are these benefits to be determined?
 4. **Will TA results be replicable to others in applicable Market sector(s)?** How narrowly are the “market sectors” defined? Will the definition(s) change?
 5. **Will the project support WIP program goals and is it consistent with state or local strategic planning?** Will it be possible to refer to another DOE section that may be more appropriate than WIP? For example, an industrial burner project may be more appropriate for Fossil Energy than WIP.
 6. **Has the requestor received prior assistance; if so, how much and how recently?** Is this given the same weight in evaluation as “significant, sustainable, impact?” This may be removing significant “merit” factor from consideration.
 7. **Does WIP have necessary expertise and resources to provide the requested TA?** What happens if they don’t have one or the other? Will other divisions accept referral?
 8. **Is the requestor contributing funding and/or making commitments of in-kind resources and capabilities to the project?** Again, this depreciates the “merit” factor. It is a gauge of local interest . What about areas of national interest such as off shore wind in the Gulf of Mexico?
 9. **Does the requestor agree to share information on project activities and results with others?** This criteria could prove to be a hindrance. Industry is already reluctant to do joint projects with government for this reason.
 10. **Are there any critical Safety or Security concerns or issues related to the request to TA?** This needs some clarification; it can be interpreted two ways. Enhanced safety/security would improve chance of being funded while a possibly dangerous project would be rejected?
 11. **Does the requestor have an effective plan for involving key stakeholders and partners in implementation of this project?** This is related to “Will TA have significant, sustainable impact?” Need some criteria for how this will be determined. There are hucksters selling snake oil everyday in the name of energy savings.
-

Hi Mark and team,

Sorry for the delay but this email came while I was traveling. If too late to include in first draft report, please consider this an early comment for second report. Note, I have been providing technical assistance to DOE since 1997 and the Federal Government since 1993, working for small businesses with direct agency contracts, MOBIS and subcontracts with ORNL and NETL. Before that for several Fortune 100 companies in deployment of management agenda items and marketing communications, training, and business process redesign across multiple facilities and divisions. I will speak freely based on this experience.

The concept of a single process always sounds good on paper. Somewhere between business process redesign and implementation, a disconnect often occurs. Resistance at the "troop level" is not for change sake, but because the new process is so driven toward consensus or the management view that it ignores the essence that created the success--the ability for the person accountable to think on their feet and respond

accordingly. Adhering to the process becomes more important than the desired result--customer service-- or to use this administration's favored term--citizen centered or business centered. Internal efficiency is next to go because you end up with the faction supporting the business process and the faction striving for results outside the process. An example of this stymied result can be seen by the slower pace, less citizen and program centered results that occurred when the communications groups were concentrated into a single entity outside the customers that they were hired to serve. The idea was good, but the process to implement did not provide empowerment with the people that had the capabilities and insight to get the job done in the most efficient and customer service manner.

My specific thoughts on your process report is that it is a great step forward, but fails to address four major areas of concern. First, it does not address the bottleneck, discussed above, and it should. Second, it makes no provision for allowing the program managers to work with the groups or companies that it has come to rely on, save a contractor reference in the appendix. Third, the process slows delivery to customers versus hastens. Fourth, there is no attention to the specialized needs of small businesses, which need to be included to meet Agency goals.

I hope you find this helpful.

Kindest regards,

Jody Messersmith, Exec.VP.
Technologists, Inc.